

THIRTY FIVE CENTS

DECEMBER 1950

# MONTHLY REVIEW

AN INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST MAGAZINE

**INSIDE THE UNITED NATIONS**

A Special Correspondent

**THE LAST FLING OF IMPERIALISM**

Julian R. Friedman

**THE CANADIAN LEFT**

A Canadian Socialist

**THE LEFT AND THE AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE**

Elgin Williams

VOL. 2

8

EDITORS . . . LEO HUBERMAN . . . PAUL M. SWEETZ

## CONTENTS

VOLUME TWO    NUMBER EIGHT    DECEMBER, 1950

REVIEW OF THE MONTH: The Elections; The Task Ahead .....	355
INSIDE THE UNITED NATIONS by a Special Correspondent .....	361
THE LAST FLING OF IMPERIALISM by Julian R. Friedman .....	372
THE CANADIAN LEFT by a Canadian Socialist .....	378
SHAW ON SOCIALISM .....	387
THE LEFT AND THE AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE by Elgin Williams .....	391
FREEDOM UNDER SOCIALISM: A COMMENT by the Editors .....	394
THE POVERTY OF STATESMANSHIP: Editorial from the "Wall Street Journal" .....	397

MONTHLY REVIEW: Published monthly and copyright, 1950, in the United States, by MONTHLY REVIEW—AN INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST MAGAZINE, 66 Barrow St., New York 14, New York.  
SUBSCRIPTION PRICE: One year—\$3.00 (foreign, \$3.50); two years—\$5.00 (foreign \$6.00).  
Single copy 35c; 15 or more 25c. (Vol. 1 No. 1 \$1.00; Vol. 2 No. 6 \$1.00)

EDITORS AND PUBLISHERS: Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy.

AMERICAN AGENT for CAHIERS INTERNATIONAUX, Paris. Subscription \$5 a year payable to MONTHLY REVIEW.

## NOTES FROM THE EDITORS

In the letter we sent to subscribers with the Matthiessen Memorial Issue, we said: "If you think MR is worth saving, it is up to you to save it. . . . We are probably more aware than any one of the limitations and shortcomings of MR, and still we think it is performing an important function—more important today than when it was started a year and a half ago. What do you think?"

We are still getting your answers, but we already know that enough of our readers think enough of the magazine to make it possible for us to continue publication for another year.

The response to our appeal has been heartening in more ways than just financially. Here, for example, is what a minister wrote: "My wife and I feel

*(continued on inside back cover)*

## THE ELECTIONS

On the whole the elections have borne out the prognosis contained in our July issue ("New Turn in American Politics?," pp. 65 ff.). The right wing of the Republican Party has made substantial gains; the Truman administration has lost strength; and the labor leaders have taken a bad beating. The new Congress will be ruled by a combination of Republicans and reactionary Democrats; the center of gravity of the "cold-war coalition" has shifted significantly to the Right.

The consequences are sure to be bad. In the field of foreign affairs, the power and influence of the Asian interventionists will be increased. MacArthur's hand will be strengthened. The doctrine of preventive war will receive new support. The chances that we will be dragged into an insane war against practically all of Asia are increased, as are the chances that such a war will quickly be turned into the ultimate disaster of World War III. On the domestic front, the persecution of dissenters will be stepped up. Legislation and governmental policies will both incline in a stronger anti-labor direction. The labor leaders and Fair Dealers who have been accustomed to receiving favors for their role in the cold war, will find the pickings thinner and thinner: some of them, indeed, can soon expect to feel the sting of the red-baiter's lash on their own backs.

What will be the response to these increasingly reactionary pressures? This is the crucial question of the immediate political future. Prophecy is, of course, out of the question, but it should be possible even now to put the finger on certain areas where decisive developments may be looked for.

In the first place, the ruling class is far from united behind the adventurous "Asia first" policy of the right-wing Republicans. Large-scale warfare in Asia would tie up the major part of America's military resources for a long time to come and would leave western Europe practically defenseless in case the war should become general. This is a particularly terrifying prospect to the ruling classes of western Europe, and their entirely legitimate fears are shared by a large part of American Big Business. Astute political maneuvering could doubtless build up the "Europe first" tendency in the ruling class and, using it

in connection with pressure from America's European allies, could counteract and possibly defeat the "Asia firsters."

We do not know whether the Truman-Acheson-Marshall team which determines administration policy will have the wit or the will to pursue this course. On the basis of the record to date, it seems doubtful. Like all centrists, they are essentially waverers who are sensitive to strong pressure from either flank. Under existing circumstances, and barring an initiative from other quarters, they are perhaps more likely to try—almost certainly futilely—to appease the Taft-Hoover-MacArthur crowd.

On the domestic front, the course of the administration is easier to predict. Truman can be counted on to champion a liberal program with greater vigor than ever—the more vigorously the smaller the chance that anything will be done to implement it. This has long been Truman's trump card, and he has learned to play it with calculating shrewdness. The pattern is a familiar one from beginning to end. The reactionaries cannot or do not want to understand that their successes at the polls are not due to popular approval of their stupid policies but are rather a "normal" manifestation of mass irritation, frustration, and apathy. Given this initial error, they quite naturally overplay their hand. All the while, Truman, who understands the surface aspects of bourgeois politics very well, carries on a great crusade for the welfare state, equal rights for Negroes, and so on. In this way Truman mends his popular fences and sets the stage for a later electoral triumph over the hapless reactionaries. Will this whole tragi-comedy be repeated again?

The answer would seem to depend largely on what happens in another area. How will the labor leaders and Fair Dealers react to being thrown out of the cold-war coalition and to being made the victims of the kind of red-hunts they themselves have been so adept at leading in recent years? If they take it lying down—"in the interests of preserving the common front against Communism"—Truman may well be able to get away with the same old act again. This seems at present to be the most likely outcome. But there is a bare possibility that enough of them will wake up to the fact that they have been playing a sucker's game to stir up a real "independence from below" movement in American politics again. If this should happen, it would of course have wide repercussions on the whole political scene, with all the various factions and parties readjusting to the new situation. But no one can now say what form those readjustments might take.

What are the interests of the Left in this grim and confused political picture?

First, we should note that there is a strong tendency in Left circles (a tendency which always appears in times of adversity) to wash our



hands of the whole unsavory business, to proclaim all who are not with us black reactionaries among whom there are no significant differences, to take refuge in our own purity of doctrine and aim. In other words, in times like these the Left tends to become a sect which is not only politically impotent but also isolated from the real currents of contemporary history.

Understandable though this tendency is, we think it should be fought against. There is a lot of difference between the Center and the Right—in the present historical context, between the “Europe first” and the “Asia first” camps in the ruling class. It is not a matter of indifference whether the leadership of the labor movement cravenly retreats before the blows of reaction or seeks to activate enough mass support to regain some of its lost influence. We have no hesitation in saying that we prefer the “Europe first” crowd to the “Asia first” crowd. We openly proclaim that a labor leader who fights, even if it is only for his own place in the sun, is serving the long-run interests of the working class better than one who gives in to the reactionaries without a struggle. We say these things for the very simple reason that they are true, and not because we waste any love on the “Europe firsters” or on the John L. Lewises of the labor movement.

At the same time, however, we do not advocate that the Left should back one faction of the ruling class against another, or throw its support to self-serving labor leaders. The Left’s main job just now is, as we argue at greater length below, to build a solid, even if small, core of convinced socialists who will be able, when conditions again become favorable, to assume the leadership of a revitalized mass movement. We on the Left can carry out this job not by retreating into sectarian isolation but by facing up to the world as it is, analyzing it rationally and critically, telling the truth about it as we see it, using every means at our command to get our message across to others, and preserving through thick and thin our faith that in the long run the truth will prevail.

## THE TASK AHEAD

In this issue (pp. 391-393) we print the final item in the “Cooperation on the Left” discussion which began in the March 1950 number of MR.

We believe that the discussion has been useful. It has brought to expression a number of different, and sometimes conflicting, views regarding the main problems facing the American Left. It has offered a medium for constructive criticism, something which has been and

still is far too scarce in the American Left. And yet it would be foolish to ignore or deny the fact that the discussion has not had the kind of success we hoped it would. It has not built up to any sort of consensus of opinion. An initially enthusiastic response to our invitation to enter the discussion gradually petered out. Any candid observer must admit that there is less, not more, cooperation on the Left at the end of 1950 than there was at the beginning. It is only necessary to point out that Henry Wallace was one of the first to respond to our invitation, while his most recent utterances indicate that in the intervening period he has completely broken with the Left.

The decisive factor in this period has, of course, been the Korean war. The Korean war has enormously strengthened the hand of American reaction at the same time that it has weakened and divided the Left. The militarization of the country has been sharply stepped up; persecution of dissenting minorities has reached unprecedented proportions; the threat of World War III is imminent and ominous. The situation facing the Left was bad enough nine months ago; it is much worse now. Perhaps it was unrealistic even then to think in terms of rallying an effective coalition of Left forces. It is certainly so now.

These are bitter facts—but facts all the same. What do they mean? That we have no alternative but to throw up our hands in despair? That we must admit defeat and can do nothing now but watch the drift to disaster?

Of course not. But they do mean that we must re-evaluate our potentialities and concentrate on aims which, in the new situation, are realistically attainable. This is not easy. It will require much hard thinking and soul-searching by every sincere progressive. The answer will not be the same for every one. Some will have greater opportunities than others. Some will inevitably be almost wholly absorbed by the bare problem of survival.

We offer no panaceas, but we believe that certain of the participants in the "Cooperation on the Left" discussion contributed analysis and guidance which should stand us all in good stead in the difficult days ahead. We reproduce here the passages which, in our judgment, are most relevant to the situation that now confronts us.

*F. O. Matthiessen:* The minimum task of thinkers on the Left is to keep articulating the fundamental issues that confront us, by every means and on every occasion we can. (May 1950, p. 11.)

*A University Teacher of Social Science:* The Left . . . is being subjected to the fiercest kind of aggression from the ruling class. Its present lot of unbridled persecution has naturally resulted in some considerable disintegration. It seems, then, that in times like these, "times that try men's souls," what is needed is not so

much an advocacy of cooperation as the development of the means whereby the *faith* of the Left may be maintained. It should be remembered in this connection that the most effective Left party thus far developed, the Bolsheviks, frequently sacrificed cooperation on the Left for faith in a principle of social change.

The normal counteraction to persecution is faith: conviction in the rightness of one's cause. And faith is anchored in understanding. Under present conditions, this understanding can come only by way of the arduous task of explaining to the articulate Left, and thus to the people, the nature of capitalist transformation. (May 1950, p. 24.)

*Historicus*: The real rub . . . is not in economic conditions. The weakness of the subjective factor in America, the impotence of the American Left, cannot be understood without a full appreciation of the *ideological* stability of American capitalism. We have to understand the ideologically overpowering impact of bourgeois, fetishistic consciousness on the broad masses of the working population. The still-vigorous belief in the possibilities of individual advancement within the framework of capitalist society. The deep-seated acceptance of bourgeois values, especially the desirability of reaching the status of the next-higher group. The supremely streamlined, multi-pronged manipulation of the public mind. The heart-breaking emptiness and cynicism of the commercial, competitive, capitalist culture. The systematic cultivation of devastatingly neurotic reactions to most social phenomena. . . . The effective destruction in schools, churches, press, everywhere, of everything that smacks of *solidarity* in the consciousness of the man in the street. And finally, the utterly paralyzing feeling of solitude which must overcome any one who does not want to conform, the feeling that there is no movement, no camp, no group to which to turn. . . .

Where does the Left and its cooperation come in? Not very much, not very broadly, not very obviously. The main avenue of activity is to attack on the ideological front—by clarifying the issues, by trying to cut through the cultural fog of capitalist society, by trying to break the notion of the "identity of interests" of the ruling class with those of the working masses. This is not a program of mass politics, nor should it be the program of a sect. It is a blueprint of intellectual activity, of enlightened economic, ideological, political thinking and discussion that would be free of dogmatic fetters and petty political considerations. It is a program of building cadres, of what Marx used to call *Selbstverständigung*.

There is hardly any room for political cooperation on the Left at the present time because there are no politics of the Left. The time will perhaps come, possibly sooner than we think. But just now the issues are ideological, and ideological problems cannot

## MONTHLY REVIEW

be solved by organizational makeshifts. . . . What is needed—let us say it again and again—is clarity, courage, patience, faith in the spontaneity of rational and socialist tendencies in society. At the present historical moment in our country—"better smaller but better." (July 1950, pp. 85-86.)

As these passages suggest, the American Left, for all its weakness and political impotence, still has an enormously important task to perform. It is the trustee of social rationality, of hope for a better future, of the ideas that must eventually be harnessed to the service of the American people as of all mankind. Those of us who were privileged to live and learn in better times have a special responsibility. We must teach and help those among the upcoming youth who are willing to learn and who will be able to take the lead in building a victorious political Left when conditions change again, as they surely will. This is as honorable a task as any, and those who do it well will be remembered with gratitude in the socialist America of the future.

(November 20, 1950)

---

## THE MARSHALL PLAN AT WORK

*The CGT, France's big Communist-led labor federation, has dug up some interesting figures on profits last year.*

*CGT claims—and government economists unofficially confirm the estimate—that profits in 1949 were 50 percent of gross business income. Wages took only 43 percent.*

*That's a sharp reversal of the prewar ratio: 29 percent for profits, 45 percent for wages.*

*The CGT also says that only about one-third of last year's profits were declared.*

*Business Week, Oct. 21, 1950*

## INSIDE THE UNITED NATIONS

BY A SPECIAL CORRESPONDENT

For many months past the United Nations has been called an arm of the American State Department. Many observers would agree that this is so, and would accept the situation as inevitable in a world where so many countries are clients (or satellites) of the United States. There are others, however, who do not accept the reasoning implicit in this last sentence, and they want to be shown.

I believe they can be shown.

Let us first consider the environment in which the UN, its Secretariat, and the national delegations work.

There are, apart from the United States, 59 countries in the UN. These countries have embassies or legations in Washington, with permanent staffs living in the capital. These embassies are accredited to the American government and are not generally supposed to represent their respective governments at the UN. However, at the General Assembly or at other meetings of the UN, there will be some embassy staff from Washington attending the sessions in New York. Most of these men (and women) have lived for some time in the United States.

The work of the UN is such that it is necessary for each country to maintain, in addition, a special staff; and, in fact, most countries do have a Permanent Delegation in New York, which for this reason has become a diplomatic center rivalling Washington in importance. Thus, for example, Mrs. Pandit is the Ambassador of India to the United States. Her offices are in Washington. But the head of the Indian Permanent Delegation is Sir Benegal Rau, who is stationed in New York.

The 60 countries making up the UN do not all actively take part in the organization's work. They are participants only at the General Assembly. The great mass of work and decisions comes from the more easily controlled small UN bodies such as the Security Council (11 members), the Trusteeship Council (12), the Economic and Social Council (18), and this latter Council's eight advisory commissions (15 to 18 members each). The five permanent members of the Security Council sit on all of these bodies. The rest of the membership rotates, and the procedure has been to stress balanced geographical representation. In practice this means devising a pliant

---

*The author has been a close observer of the United Nations since its inception.*

## MONTHLY REVIEW

majority for the United States. (Eastern Europe is, of course, always in the minority.) The majority of these key UN bodies consists of the economically developed Marshall Plan nations (including the "mature" Commonwealth countries—Canada, Australia, New Zealand) plus obvious satellites who understand quickly how to vote—countries like Ecuador, the Philippines, and Turkey. One principle seems to have taken priority over all others: there must never be a majority of underdeveloped countries.

One result of the narrow control of UN organs is that many delegations hardly know what goes on: they are lost in a sea of paper the contents of which are quite unfamiliar, and are actually eager to be told how to vote in order not to make a mistake. Incidentally, the United States makes very sure it controls the office-holders of the more important committees of the General Assembly. For example, the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Political Committee are at present from Colombia and Belgium, those of the Special Ad Hoc Political Committee from Peru and Greece.

Most of the Permanent Delegations have two or three diplomatic people and an equal number of office staff. The larger countries have larger delegations; for example, Britain or France or the USSR might have a permanent staff of say 20 professional people plus office staff. The United States also maintains a permanent force in New York to attend to day-to-day matters. This group, the United States Mission to the UN, has an authorized staff of 190 persons. The Mission does a certain amount of protocol work, but in the main its duty is to service the work at Lake Success and to keep in touch with the foreign delegations.

To complete the picture of the international machinery, it must be remembered, and indeed emphasized, that the United States keeps large diplomatic establishments in other countries; that its ECA representatives are, in addition, in daily touch with the Marshall Plan governments of Europe; that ECA representatives are now in South East Asia and the Far East; and that the United States is a member of such regional groups as the Economic Commission for Latin America, the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, the South Pacific Regional Commission, the Caribbean Commission, the Pan-American Sanitary Bureau, and various other inter-American agencies. On the side of war preparations and war coordination, the United States works closely with the Atlantic Pact countries, the British Commonwealth, and Latin America. No other country has anything approaching this broad network of international contacts.

At the national level, the United States also has unique advantages. The State Department (that is, the American foreign office) is not more than two hours away from Lake Success by plane. The

State Department's tickertape and telephone connections with New York are superior to the facilities of any other foreign office trying to keep in touch with its delegation, and the American delegation has the advantage of privacy in its telephone conversations. In the case of some specialized agencies of the UN, the physical pressure of American official policy is even greater—the International Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and the Food and Agriculture Organization all have their headquarters in Washington; while the International Civil Aviation Organization is not far away in Montreal.

When the General Assembly convenes in New York, the picture becomes more crowded. Each UN delegation to the Assembly is allowed five delegates, five alternates, and as many advisers and experts as it cares to pay for. Some of the smaller countries cannot afford to have five delegates even when they draw on their permanent diplomatic offices in the United States—and they may have no advisers or alternates whatsoever. The United States delegation on any one day may, on the other hand, amount to as many as 100 people (with reserve echelons of advisers, experts, consultants, and translators in Washington). The practice is to have a separate team for each major subject. In other delegations, one man may have to handle all the subjects coming before his committee, or he may even have to sit on two committees at once. (In addition to plenary sessions, the UN Assembly has seven committees: Political, Special Political, Economic, Social, Trusteeship, Budgetary, and Legal.)

Not only does the picture become more crowded when the General Assembly is in session, it becomes more complex. The delegates who represent the United States and speak in the committees are usually political appointees—one must be a Republican, one a woman, one a national figure to impress the floating vote at election times or to impress the overseas newspaper reader at all times. Usually the most able of the delegation are not in the front seat. They seldom speak. They are the "negotiators," the speech writers, the ears-to-the-grounders, the hand-in-the-velvet-glove men. The actual American spokesman at the UN says what he is told to say, not by the President or Congress, but by the State Department's experts. The "negotiators" deal with the major countries that need attention and whose national prestige is important; in short, they deal with the United Kingdom, France, India, and to some extent with the more stubborn smaller Commonwealth countries. Each of the hand-in-velvet-glove men has a small group of delegations which are his responsibility. They know him and he knows them, their personal idiosyncracies, their power and the power behind them. For example, one man will handle the delegates of, say, Bolivia, Ecuador, and Peru; another will handle Lebanon, Syria, and Egypt; and so on.

One of the most powerful influences on UN delegations and on the Secretariat is the United States scene itself. The language spoken is an American form of English, and English is not the mother tongue of most delegations. All problems discussed in the press are discussed in English and in American concepts. Delegations and UN Secretariat get their daily news and their daily impressions of what is important in the world from the New York press, the American radio and television. Their leisure reading is most probably *Life*, *Time*, *Newsweek*, *Readers' Digest*, and the Sunday papers. Religious influences are mainly conservative Christian from churches supported by self-confident capitalism. The UN worships a God who is a Christian American with Roman Catholic leanings. Moslems, Buddhists, atheists, agnostics, who are much more representative of the world than capitalist Christians, get very little attention in New York. Movies are American; social life is largely American; sports meetings, law courts, loyalty tests, witch-hunts, mechanical gadgets are all American. And they all have an effect. The dishonest headlines, the statements of Republican and Democratic politicians, the speeches of Mrs. Roosevelt, the intemperate outbursts on international affairs, the writings of George Sokolsky and his ilk are conditioning the UN delegate and the UN staff member just as much as they are conditioning the remainder of the captive audience in the United States.

In sharp contrast to the League of Nations buildings in Geneva, at Lake Success one sees the American way of life on all sides—the cafeteria with its loudspeakers, the Coca Cola vending machines in the corridors, the newsstand with its *Daily News*, its glamor magazines, and its costume jewelry display, the Western Union office, the United States Post Office, the Chemical and Trust Bank. The chauffeurs are American citizens, as are most of the guards; the audience attending the conferences, or following them on radio or television, and the newspaper men who report them, are mainly Americans; the remarks made by delegates are said with an eye on an inch or two of space in the *New York Times* or the *Herald Tribune*. The delegates and staff live in American apartments, served by American telephones, with wire-tapping accepted as a necessary part of living. This, then, is the atmosphere of the United Nations.

To live at the level of the New York middle class, delegation and Secretariat members must receive incomes much higher than they need or would get in other countries. They begin to accept the automobile as part of life, the refrigerator and its frozen foods, the supermarket with its shiny packages, the washing machine and television. All this saps at their own cultural inheritance, and most of them succumb. They gradually begin to like being here and—this is important—they don't want to go home. This influence of Amer-



icanism can be as insidious as the headlines and the advertisements.

The chauffeurs and guards are not the only natives working for the UN; at least two out of every three of the Secretariat staff are American citizens. The lower grades (secretarial, clerical, and so on) are locally recruited. This group is soon to be expanded. But let us look at the higher grades, at section heads and higher. There are 332 persons in these controlling categories. Of these, 83 are Americans, 47 are Britons, 35 are French, 41 come from northwest Europe (Belgium, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Netherlands), 35 from the Commonwealth outside the United Kingdom, 28 from Latin America, 18 from China, 11 from Poland, 5 from Czechoslovakia, 5 from the USSR, and the remainder come in ones and twos from other countries. The United States, the British Commonwealth, and northwest Europe (including France) thus supply three-quarters of the senior staff. In addition, there are others who would normally be expected to support the United States politically—Peronistas, White Russians, London Poles, Austrians. Thus the fact that there are eleven Poles and five Czechoslovaks on the senior staff does not mean that they are all supporters of the existing regimes in their respective countries.

It should be added that the members of the staff from the United States are not all in favor of the State Department line. Some are old New Dealers, some are liberals, a few may even be socialists. But these people are being weeded out; the point to be stressed here is that the key men go down the line with the State Department.

The most important post in the UN is that of Assistant Secretary General in charge of Administration and Financial Services. The holder is Byron Price, former head of United States war censorship. He controls the Bureau of Personnel which does all the screening, hiring, and firing of staff; he controls the Bureau of the Budget which sets up and determines every established post in the UN; he controls the Bureau of Finance which looks after the spending of the money and has a strong influence on what is done by the non-administrative departments such as Trusteeship, Economic Affairs, and Social Affairs. In his domain are also the Buildings Management Service, Headquarters Planning Service, the Inspection Service (for staff and operation), and the Field Service which covers UN offices overseas, UN guards, and any UN missions which may be sent to the Balkans, the Middle East, Korea, or other trouble spots. In parentheses it should be noted that the Director of the Bureau of Personnel is a Vichy Frenchman.

Another almost equally important post is that of Executive Assistant to the Secretary General. He is the man who does the work for Trygve Lie (whose main function is to make public appearances

## MONTHLY REVIEW

and public utterances). The Executive Assistant is another American, Andrew Cordier. It is Cordier who runs the General Assembly; it is Cordier who supervises the execution of all political policy; it was Cordier rather than the Korean experts in the Department of Security Council Affairs who handled the Korean business.

A third very important post is that of Legal Counsel to the Secretary General. He is the man who tells Trygve Lie how to make it legal, how to draft loopholes, how, for example, to use language which to the uninitiated made the Korean business appear in accordance with the Charter. His name is Abe Feller, another American.

The UN Secretariat could be analyzed in another way—by answering the question: Who are the "insiders"? What American on the UN staff represents Tammany Hall? Who makes sure that the electrical equipment and maintenance contracts go to the right American firms? Who handles the enormous orders for printing? Who gets tickets for the ball game when even diplomatic pressure fails? Who gets in touch with the New York police when a staff member gets too many "tickets"? Who lets the cafeteria contract, the car contracts, the cleaning contract (worth \$788,000)? Who lets the wire-tappers work without interference? Who lets FBI agents question staff members about fellow workers? Who are straight representatives of the State Department? Who, finally, are the FBI agents themselves? The answers to these questions would take another article. They are posed here to emphasize that Lake Success is in the United States, and to suggest that the oath of loyalty to the UN is often signed with mental reservations.

Other evidences of Americanism on the staff of the UN are a lack of understanding of human and civil rights, and the fact that no attempt seems ever to have been made to orient the staff on what should be their basic approach to international problems. There is color prejudice at the UN; there is anti-semitism; there is pressure to conform. Senator McCarthy has his sympathizers in the UN administration. Any American or non-American who is judged "un-American" may quickly find his job gone. Byron Price, who presumably has signed an international loyalty oath, tells American audiences that Communism degrades the individual and ruthlessly disregards human life. (*New York Herald Tribune*, Sept. 19, 1950) Apparently he has no idea of the international gravity of his offense. But the UN Secretariat knows what the boss means: they must hew to the United States line. For example, on November 1, 1950, Price issued a circular to all staff members announcing that arrangements were being made to donate blood for the forces in Korea. The last sentence of the circular reads: "I want you all to remember that this program is only a small part of our total effort

## INSIDE THE UNITED NATIONS

in Korea, and I would like to see an enthusiastic response." It is, of course, no part of the duty of an international civil servant to accept what might be acceptable to an American. But the atmosphere at Lake Success is not only American in a general sense, it is American in the McCarran-Hickenlooper-Mundt sense.

Imagine what the UN would be like if its headquarters were in Moscow, with sixty delegations permanently there, with two-thirds of the staff Russians, with three-quarters of the senior staff Russians, Poles, and Czechoslovaks, with Soviet telephone and cable systems, with no representative of Tammany Hall but only of the Communist Party, with only Russian radio and television, with only Russian ballet, opera, and theatre, with *Izvestia* and *Pravda* to read and messages from Tass, with no ball game, and a subway without advertisements, with Mr. Stalin making a policy speech from the General Assembly rostrum on the fifth anniversary of the UN, and no Coca Cola. And, as an afterthought, the contract for operating the elevators at the new UN building would not be let to a man who, with the agreement of a Tammany representative, underlines the menial nature of the job by employing only Negroes.

So much for penetration of the UN by the American environment. Now for the dynamics of United States control.

Briefly, this is how it works. Weeks before each General Assembly, the State Department will have established its position on the main questions on the agenda. These will be cabled or sent through the diplomatic pouch to all American embassies abroad. In each capital, except in eastern Europe and those countries not deemed worth cultivating or consulting, the ambassador and his military, economic, agricultural, labor, and educational attachés will get to work. At official meetings or on social occasions the line will be put across to the local departmental officials, cabinet ministers, or business bigwigs.

At the same time, all the embassies in Washington will be given the American line so that the foreign officials in Washington can answer cabled inquiries from their governments and at the same time become more familiar with the Washington approach. As a parallel process, the American Mission to the UN in New York will work on the Permanent Delegations—by official visits, social occasions, and sometimes joint conferences. For example, the American Mission will invite all the Latin Americans to a conference. The next day it will be the turn of the northwest Europeans. Or, if it is during the General Assembly, there may be a few parties held at the Roosevelt home in Hyde Park.

Everything said by any delegate is reported back in memo form to the American Mission. In this way the United States can assess the amount of unanimity in the various delegations, the objections,

and—this is important—the status of the objecting delegates. Very soon, the American government will know which ones need further working over. An invariable practice is to approach the recalcitrant delegation at a higher level. If the adviser is making objections to the American line, the approach will be to his delegate. If a delegate is objecting, the approach will be to the chief delegate. If *he* objects, the approach will be to his government. The superior officer will reverse the line for the sake of his own popularity, or to stop the pressure, or not to become the target for complaints himself. If the dissent from American policy arises from his instructions, he will try to get his instructions reversed.

This process goes on right through the General Assembly. It is particularly maintained on the major political questions; but because the United States, being immature in international affairs, hates defeat even on points of minor importance, no delegate and no committee can hope to escape pressure. In private conversation, delegates will bitterly tell how the Americans have gone to their ambassador, or to their government, complained of their position, and succeeded in getting it reversed. There is no face-saving. The reversed delegate must be made to look like a punished schoolboy.

The ambassador likes living at the embassy; the delegate likes the honor and emoluments of his job. Nobody wants to be recalled, especially if the recall is due to American hints that the representative is "uncooperative." Many countries do not have a career service, and a recalled diplomat may really be losing a job. In sum, there are only two things that will offset American pressure—government policy and human dignity. And what is the value of human dignity if one gets recalled for offending the United States?

The process of bringing delegations into line is known as "arm-twisting." This generally occurs when a new situation arises and there is insufficient time to build up pressure on national governments. It occurs because some delegates are permitted to use their own judgment on some things. They are of course bound on a "political" matter. A "political" matter is anything that is against the USSR. On this question, the Latin Americans and most other countries are solidly with the United States. This is not necessarily because the delegations or governments think the United States is always right and the USSR always wrong. Many governments would lose office at election time if their opponents called them Communist sympathizers. (Another strong force in this direction is the Roman Catholic Church which largely dominates the vote of the twenty-one Latin American countries, of the Philippines, the Netherlands, Australia, Canada, Belgium, Luxembourg. In this, the Church and United States foreign policy run parallel.) The anti-Soviet propaganda that pours

around the world has so convinced the middle group of voters that put governments in and out of office that, for domestic political reasons alone, they cannot vote with the USSR. The very existence of this situation must be counted as a real victory for American foreign policy.

A powerful American weapon is the threat of the anger of Congress and the withholding of funds. This weapon is so strong that it automatically secures the vote of many countries on 95 percent of the issues. Thus, for most purposes, the following Marshall Plan and Truman Doctrine countries have no independent voice in the UN: the United Kingdom, France, Belgium, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Sweden, Denmark, Iceland, Greece, Turkey. For Commonwealth and other reasons, the following countries stick by the American and British position: Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Pakistan. India is an interesting case of a country that has on occasion taken an initial stand against the United States (on Korea, for example) and has subsequently been pressured into reversing its position. Several times during the current General Assembly, the Indian delegation has appeared to its own people in a progressive light. But by the time an Indian resolution had come through the process of editing at the hands of American and British experts, it had lost its teeth—and the Indians acquiesced.

American control of the International Bank and the Monetary Fund also plays a role. For example, the long-maintained assault by the United States on the economic and social life of the United Kingdom was stepped up in a recent pronouncement of the Fund that Britain no longer needs to control its foreign exchanges. The British have in recent years introduced progressive legislation, improved social security, given free medical service, promoted full employment, controlled prices, allocated raw materials, selected the imports they required from the countries they could afford to buy from, and continued their policy of bilateral trade agreements. The success of these policies is tied in with the control of foreign exchange. Break this control and you break the progressive side of British domestic policy. International finance could then repeat the job it did on Ramsay MacDonald in 1931.

American pressure through the Bank is obvious. Countries have to wait around a long time before they get their loans. If they get into line, the loan is there. Poland has not got its loan. Yugoslavia has. Australia has. Holland has.

Most of the Latin American countries are direct satellites of the United States and need not be discussed separately. If any of them attempts to show independence, it is soon stamped upon. It must be remembered that the United States has been acting in Latin America

## MONTHLY REVIEW

in a unilateral way for years. Every year funds are allotted to each country by the State Department or by other Washington agencies. The Truman Doctrine was not really invented for Greece and Turkey—it had existed for years in the Western Hemisphere.

The Philippines and Thailand and the Formosan Chinese are also direct satellites of the United States. During recent months, millions of ECA dollars have been spent in Indonesia, Burma, and Indo-China. Burma and Indonesia may therefore soon be added to the satellite list. In the Middle East, the United States is also finally in control, though this group of countries has been rebellious during the current Assembly. The United States has given no Marshall aid and little "Truman" money to this area, and the countries concerned are very dissatisfied about it. They do not favor the USSR, but they are willing to play off the USSR against the United States unless more aid and trade come their way. At the commercial and general business level, of course, the United States is firmly in control, and its pressures are exerted as often through oil companies as through embassies. This group of countries consists of Lebanon, Syria, Israel, Egypt, Iraq (a partial British dependency), Iran, Saudi Arabia, and Yemen. For purposes of classification, Afghanistan, Ethiopia, and Liberia (Firestone Rubber) may also be included in this group.

One interesting aspect of American control is that it firmly covers the progressive "western" parliamentary democracies of northwestern Europe and the Commonwealth. This not only has international political and economic implications; it also explains why the UN has great difficulties in writing conventions on human rights, freedom of information, rights of children, and so forth; why its economic and social work is so sterile. The United States is the most socially backward of the western democracies, and therefore American influence in the UN prevents the codification or advocacy of social practices accepted in such countries as the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, and the Scandinavian countries. That is why the UN does not come out for full social security, free medical care, Keynesian economics, price control, exchange control. But the development of this subject would take a book.

A good example of American control is to be seen in the recent struggle over the UN Secretary-Generalship. The USSR had successfully maneuvered until Lie became the candidate of the United States only. He was not the candidate of the British, Chinese, French, or Russians. Very few countries wanted him. The UN Charter said that the Secretary General had to be recommended by the Security Council. That meant that there had to be unanimity among the United States, Great Britain, the Soviet Union, France, and China. There were at least two candidates (from India and Mexico respectively)

acceptable to all but the United States. To keep Trygve Lie in the job, the Americans would have to veto every candidate put up and do this until it had worn the others down. And the spectacle would have made the United States the laughing stock of the world. The United States therefore decided to go over the heads of the Security Council and ask the General Assembly to endorse Lie. This was an illegal act, and all delegations knew it. The United States had to prevent candidates from coming forward and get the greatest possible majority in the General Assembly to agree to the illegal reappointment of Lie. Warren Austin (American chief delegate) therefore issued a press statement saying that Lie's appointment was essential to the security of the United States, that the United States would veto any other candidate, that any man allowing his name to go forward would be regarded as opposed to Lie's position on Korea, and that 53 nations had agreed with Lie's stand on Korea. This statement served notice that the issue was a high political and military one and therefore part of the cold war, that any opposing candidate was automatically pro-Communist, that even if 10,000 candidates were named the United States would veto the lot, and that the 53 nations had better do something about it.

The Mexican and Indian names were thereupon withdrawn, the United States did not have to use its veto, and the General Assembly dutifully—and illegally—gave the United States 53 votes for Lie.

---

*Find out just what people will submit to, and you have found out the exact amount of injustice and wrong which will be imposed upon them; and these will continue till they are resisted with either words or blows, or with both. The limits of tyrants are prescribed by the endurance of those whom they oppress.*

Frederick Douglass

## THE LAST FLING OF IMPERIALISM

BY JULIAN R. FRIEDMAN

A world of empires and colonies—or a world of no empires and no colonies. Which of these two worlds we are to have is unmistakably the paramount issue of our very disturbed century. Warfare in Korea, to say nothing of the hostilities in Indo-China, in Malaya, and elsewhere shows that today peoples and classes are willing to shed blood and invite world-wide devastation over this issue.

It is beyond the power of any single nation or bloc of nations today to revive imperialism successfully or to destroy it completely. But whether there is to be more or less imperialism at the moment, and whether its demise is to come sooner or later, are questions which depend upon the policies of individual nations.

None is more deeply involved in this matter than the United States. Its activities are crucial by virtue of the strength and ubiquity of its influence. Needless to say, the interests of the American people and the good name of the United States are very much at stake in the course the American government and American business pursue towards one or the other of these two contrasting worlds.

Since V-J Day many actions of the United States government have put it on record where colonial questions are directly or indirectly involved. Its policies and maneuvers in the past five years establish almost indisputably that the Truman administration has been prolonging the life of imperialism, underwriting the colonial ventures of European empires, bringing the name of the United States into disrepute among peoples of Asia and Africa, and leaving unchecked, where not actually encouraging, those who would have the United States extend its dominions beyond the seas.

Such wholesale criticism of the administration requires some explanation. Looking first of all at Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, American Samoa, and the many other small Pacific Islands—in other words at the American possessions—we find these territories still in a distinctly colonial relationship with the United States.

The end of the Pacific War, with its clear political and moral

---

*The author, an authority in the field of colonial studies, is on the teaching staff of the London School of Economics and Political Science.*



## THE LAST FLING OF IMPERIALISM

lessons, presented the United States with a rare opportunity for opening a new era in the administration of its own dependencies. It is now obvious that the Truman administration took very little advantage of this opportunity. It has failed to be guided by the two great declarations of principle enunciated during and after the war: the Atlantic Charter proclaimed "the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live"; and the Charter of the United Nations declared "the interests of the inhabitants of the [non-self governing] territories are paramount." Nor has it applied the traditional American formula of "free" government to its possessions, namely, a constitutionally-arranged combination of a) "republican form of government," b) representation in Congress and in the Electoral College for the selection of President and Vice-President, and c) rights exclusively reserved to the local peoples and their political unit. Certainly the gubernatorial reform in Puerto Rico in 1947-48 and administrative changes in Guam in 1949-50 have fallen far short of even minimal democratic standards; by no means do the reforms that have been enacted eradicate or even begin to eradicate the colonial features of these or the other American possessions.\*

It is sometimes said that the peoples of these territories fare as well as, if not better than, the peoples of many communities on the mainland. Unfortunately this is altogether too true. There are far too many people in the United States who are treated like "colonials," and too often the peoples of the dependencies are treated in the manner of second-class citizens of Alabama or Georgia.

The American colonial possessions constitute only one of the important testing grounds for the Truman administration on matters imperial and colonial. The other is the European empires. Through the economic and military assistance programs to which the United States is currently committed, the administration has plunged the American people very deeply into the affairs of the empire-colony world.

Briefly, here is the setting: The economic and military crisis of Europe is empire-wide. The conditions preceding World War II, and

---

\* Since the above was written, Public Law No. 600 (July 3, 1950) has been enacted. This is a law "to provide for the organization of a constitutional government by the people of Puerto Rico"; it only blackens, not brightens, the record of the United States in colonial affairs. It seems to be a "Heads I win, tails you lose" piece of legislation. While Puerto Rico is to get, at some future date, a paper constitution containing virtually nothing that it does not already enjoy in the way of home rule, the United States obtains what the Puerto Ricans have so far refused to concede, namely, their explicit consent to American rule over their country. It is hardly surprising that violent demonstrations should have accompanied the innocuous preliminaries to the application of Public Law No. 600.

the war itself, have drastically decreased the ability of the western European nations not only to sustain themselves but also to preserve their empires and to reassert "white supremacy" in Asia and Africa. Coincident with the European crisis is the determination of virtually all colonial peoples to press vigorously, as local conditions permit, for independence. Such movements are not new, but they now possess a wide range of political experience from the supply and fighting fronts in the recent war and from underground and guerilla activities. Hence the metropolis-colony ratio of power is moving substantially in favor of the colonial peoples.

This is where the United States comes into the picture. Europe needs food, machines, and raw materials for survival, reconstruction, and expansion. For basically identical purposes and also for national independence, the colonies need much of the same food, machines, and raw materials. Whichever has its requirements met first by the United States gains the vital advantage over the other.

What is happening now? American economic (also military) assistance goes directly to the western European nations. When it is intended for the colonies, it reaches them only after consultation with and permission from the mother countries. This occurs in the case of aid under the Marshall Plan, and it is also the pattern contemplated in certain circles with respect to Point Four aid.

Whatever the reasons may be for channeling American assistance in this manner, the net effect is to strengthen the imperialist powers—especially the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, and France—in their dealings with their nationalistic colonies. Where the colony has been fighting to sever its imperial ties, as for instance in Indo-China, resistance has been prolonged as a result of Marshall aid and military defense contributions. When the mother country is finally compelled to grant dominion status or independence, it finds American assistance most helpful in strengthening its bargaining position in negotiations with the former colony. The Indonesian case suffices to illustrate this point conclusively. Moreover, since these overseas programs in their present form tend to preserve the class distribution of power and the systems of production now prevailing in the European empires, the transfer of authority to the colonial people takes place under conditions that postpone a social revolution essential to the complete termination of colonial status. What a burdensome heritage the Indian people and Pandit Nehru received when the United Kingdom handed, in a peaceful and formal manner, control of India to the British-groomed, deeply-entrenched ruling classes of that country!

The economic arrangements under which the United States is dealing with western Europe place a premium on the European

possession of colonial territories. As long as "European recovery" is linked to the dollar, the empires are encouraged to retain colonies and conduct relations with the weak nations on a colonial or semi-colonial basis. The targets of the Marshall Plan are based on the assumption that dollars earned by the colonies will continue to be available to the mother countries. Furthermore, were these colonial dollars not at the disposal of the western European nations for their own use now, Marshall aid would have to be increased substantially, a proposition that is not likely to find favor with Congress. Moreover, as the procurement of strategic raw materials is a feature of the European Recovery Program that Congress values very highly, the European nations need the colonies to satisfy Congress on this matter.

At the present time (July, 1950) a substantial portion of the dollars that the European nations require for the purchase of "hard-currency" commodities is earned by the colonies. Orders and regulations are in force and procedures in operation that bring the dollars earned by colonial exports into the hands of the metropolitan governments. Illustrative of this situation is an exchange of remarks between Sir J. Barlow and the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies in the House of Commons on July 20, 1949.

*Sir J. Barlow:* If the rubber value in Malaya is allowed to diminish, it will prejudice the quantity of dollars which that country can earn for itself and us as well. It is interesting to note, however, that apparently the Colonial Office allows Malaya to keep for her own use approximately half the dollars she earns. . . . I suggest that, in the circumstances, that figure is too great.

*The Under-Secretary:* The hon. Member knows that there is now a temporary stop order in force. . . . I am not going into the question whether Malaya takes too many dollars or not. (HANSARD, July 20, 1949, pp. 1461, 1511.)

In addition to the dollars they earn for the empires, the colonies also supply to the European nations in exchange for sterling, commodities that might otherwise have to be imported from the dollar area. The Dollar now joins Christianity, Civilization, and Dual Mandate as a rationalization of empire.

Through the Economic Cooperation Administration (ECA), the United States government is now deeply involved in the "colonial development and welfare" of the European empires. Its contributions in this sphere are, however, in great danger of being overshadowed by patent disservice to the colonial peoples. American participation diminishes relatively their voice in these matters; it is a blow to the local consultation, representation, and accountability that have been

evolving. Furthermore, ECA colonial projects jeopardize some valuable planned schemes which may now be deprived of sterling subsidies, especially if the sterling equivalent of dollar assistance to the colonies has to be placed in the existing "counterpart" accounts. Another danger to the advancement of colonial peoples is ECA support of "continuing cooperation" among the British, French, Belgians, Portuguese, and South Africans in Africa. This is tantamount to confronting the peoples of Africa with a heavily subsidized imperialist front. Moreover, when American activities lessen the rivalries among the empires, they reduce the opportunities for nationalist movements in Africa to exploit for their own progress the weakness of imperialism.

Do colonial peoples stand to gain anything at all from world-wide American expansion? Some people have argued that pressure from the United States weakens the European empires and that American influence, especially when it is conditioned by the anti-empire feeling of the American people, results in less pernicious colonial practices by the European nations. Realistically, however, the present situation is one in which the United States bolsters the western European powers in colonial matters and leaves colonial administration entirely in their hands. No doubt the colonies *could* benefit heavily from American capital equipment and "know-how," but to what degree they *do* benefit depends upon the terms and conditions under which they receive assistance from the United States. It is not a question of whether American activities are a constructive alternative to European imperialism, but whether they are a constructive alternative to activities that the UN (of the San Francisco Charter) might be instructed to undertake, or an alternative to some other projects for economic development that would be internationally arranged and locally controlled.

What is there in this American expansion for the American people? First of all, the world-wide reputation of the United States as the champion of oppressed peoples is bound to be destroyed. Secondly, the American people will inherit the resentment and opposition that the peoples of Asia and Africa already openly display towards the western European powers. Thirdly, the wealth that certain groups in the United States are acquiring from imperialist ventures is obtained at the expense of both the colonial and particularly the American peoples. As nearly everyone now knows, colonial systems are means by which a small militant capitalist section of the community profits heavily at the expense of the entire community that has to foot the bill and man the armed services for making colonial areas "safe" for investment and trade. Will expenditures under the Marshall Plan and Point Four be deducted from the

dividends that American corporations earn overseas? The answer is unquestionably—no!

Furthermore, there is the danger that the more the American economy relies on raw materials from exploitation-wage areas and on exports to poverty-markets, the more American workers are going to be compelled to live off the misery of foreign labor and become "cheap" themselves. This is the tragic lesson that the present economic crisis has already brought home to European workers. They are socialists, but under "western civilization" they cannot afford to let colonies go free. Besides, the more wealth the imperialist elements accumulate overseas, the more resources they have for combating democratic elements at home. This is the crucial lesson that the recent general election in the United Kingdom teaches the British people.

American capital that goes overseas under generous guarantees and subsidies from the United States government is capital that might very well be attracted or directed to underdeveloped areas at home. Capitalists find in foreign investment an expedient and profitable way both of escaping temporarily overproduction for the home market, and of maintaining the political and social *status quo* that might otherwise be endangered by new movements of population and new alignments of class interests that might result from further investment at home.

If the current tendency of the United States to sustain the world of empires and colonies is to be reversed, the best way to proceed is to get the Missouri Valley Authority, the Columbia River Authority, and other development authorities under way; expand and improve public education at all levels; protect health nationally; increase real wages, especially in poverty-line areas; institute FEPCs nationally and locally; enforce anti-monopoly measures; direct profits towards enlightened social ends; and undertake other such progressive acts—in other words, improve the living conditions of the American people and curb the activities of American imperialist elements. Such domestic achievements, combined with a rational foreign policy, would bring the American people into fruitful cooperation with those peoples of China, India, the Philippines, the USSR, Nigeria—and even France and Britain—who are in the process of narrowing the openings for imperialism. This is the way the American people can help doom the world of empires and colonies and enlarge the world of no empires and no colonies.

## THE CANADIAN LEFT

BY A CANADIAN SOCIALIST

The Left in Canada has developed according to a pattern which is European rather than American but which has been sharply modified by factors peculiar to Canada. The first of these factors is the existence of French Canada, a submerged nation struggling for recognition as part of the Canadian Confederation; the second is the colonialism of English Canada, some sections of which tend to follow British leadership and to retain a certain British respect for law. The paramount influence on all Canada is of course the United States. The Left either yields to it or rebels against it.

French Canada, centered in Quebec, is the most potentially revolutionary body in North America, not excepting even the Negroes, because of its closely knit loyalty, its pride in its own culture, its hatred of imperialism, and its resentment of exploitation by foreign capital. Quebec's representatives in the Canadian Parliament (it has 73 in all) were and are the cornerstone of former Prime Minister Mackenzie King's and present Prime Minister St. Laurent's Liberal administration. But the only M.P.'s who protested the government's policy of aid to the United States in Korea were three from Quebec, one Progressive-Conservative and two independents. The Liberal Party in Quebec has long had an almost independent organization; now it is coming to depend more on the national Liberal organization than Quebecers like. The province has parties of its own, such as provincial Premier Duplessis' National Union, which rise and fall on issues concerning relations with the federal government and foreign policy. The rapid industrialization of Quebec by American capital, cramming the cities with uprooted farm sons and daughters, is the greatest challenge to left-wing parties in Canada.

As for the British carry-over, the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation (CCF) is a little brother of the British Labor Party and looked to it for guidance in its early years just as the Progressive-Conservatives look to Churchill. In the United States, social democracy has never been of much importance in elections, but in Canada the CCF has for several years been a sizable third party in federal contests, and until the 1949 election had high hopes of

---

*The author of this article writes regularly about Canadian affairs for the press of both Britain and the United States.*

becoming the official parliamentary opposition. Its strength is mainly in the West, where it forms the government of the big prairie province of Saskatchewan.

The CCF was organized in 1932. Its roots were the right wing of the earlier Canadian Labor Party, the short-lived Progressive Party of 1920, the United Farmers, and other such attempts to gather farmers and workers together for joint political action. Its immediate forerunner was the League for Social Reconstruction (LSR), an association of study groups which had its humorous aspects but did give CCF leaders an opportunity to publish some valuable analyses of Canadian economic life, with plans for its reform. The Liberals later adopted some of these plans: the Family Allowances, or Baby Bonus, plan for which Mr. King will long be best remembered among the poor was undoubtedly filched from the CCF. The LSR took itself very seriously, being composed of male and female spinsters from the educated professions who met to listen devotedly to the gospel preached by CCF leaders. Working-class people did not frequent its affairs.

The CCF's first president was J. S. Woodsworth, a highly respected minister from Winnipeg, who alone of his party voted against war credits ten years ago. Its founders hoped that the party would, as a federation, like its British model, draw to itself and incorporate such organizations as the unions and the cooperatives; but things didn't work out that way. Cooperatives in Canada, except the wheat pools and the various kinds of cooperatives in Quebec, have had no more impact than in the United States. In Quebec they are important, as credit unions, farmers' marketing channels, and consumers' groups, but they are fiercely nationalist and have no connection with the CCF. In 1943 the Canadian Congress of Labor, which includes CIO unions in Canada and a number of large independent unions, voted to adopt the CCF as its political arm, and has maintained this policy. It is hard to say just what that has amounted to in practice. A. R. Mosher, head of the Canadian Congress of Labor, has never called himself a socialist; and while a number of its leaders, particularly in steel, are active CCFers, the rank and file have obviously never voted en bloc for CCF candidates. On the other hand, some Canadian Congress of Labor unions have been expelled for being "red-led," and raiding on locals accused of Communist tendencies by others in which CCFers are prominent has been a disruptive force in Canadian unionism.

The creed of the CCF is Fabian socialism, at one time considerably influenced by the Roosevelt New Deal. Its national president is M. J. Coldwell, M.P. from a Saskatchewan constituency, a former teacher who was born in England but has long been identified with the West. Professor Frank Scott, who teaches international law at

McGill University in Montreal, was national chairman until this year and has had an important role in shaping policy. A man of brilliant mind, witty and learned, son of a famous Anglican clergyman, he has never mixed in down-to-earth campaigning and his knowledge of farmers' and workers' problems is purely theoretical. Living in Montreal, he is deeply interested in French Canada, and has at times appeared to support the extreme French nationalist position. He is credited with bringing into the CCF Mme. Thérèse Casgrain, the unquestioned leader of French Canadian women in their struggle for enfranchisement. (The lack of legal protection and civil rights for married women in Quebec is a story by itself.) Professor Scott, though he will continue to wield much influence, has been replaced as national chairman by Percy Wright, M.P. from Saskatchewan, a farmer who is neither student nor theorist of socialism, but a practical and popular politician who simply wants to see better prices for wheat and less exploitation by monopolies. David Lewis, Polish-born and Oxford-educated (Rhodes scholar) has resigned his post as national secretary to earn more money practising law, after giving many years to building the CCF. He also is succeeded by a westerner.

The swing to western bases is a result of the defeat which the CCF suffered in 1949 when it went from over 800,000 votes in the last previous election to about 700,000 (out of a 5-million total). The CCF representation in Parliament dropped more than proportionally, from 29 to 13. This debacle was an aspect of the Liberal landslide, which in turn was due to the fact that people didn't want to run any risk of having the Tories back in power, and so took no chance on a third party. The CCF was also seriously distracted by revolts among those who disagreed violently with its leaders' approval of the Atlantic Pact and of government foreign policy. The party now has one M.P., from the East, the perennial Clarie Gillis from the Cape Breton minefields, and one from Ontario. The rest are all westerners. It has never made any headway in Quebec and for this reason could not become a truly national party. When a French Canadian makes the terrific break with Church and home nurture which joining any socialist party entails, he is likely to go the whole hog and become a Communist. Halfway measures don't engage him. CCFers in Quebec are mostly English Canadian plus a few French Canadian labor union men.

The CCF break with the Communists finally came over the Russian invasion of Finland in the first winter of World War II. In a carefully planned speech, David Lewis classed Russia with the aggressor nations—regretfully, he said. Before that he had made effort to maintain a liaison with the Communists, though there was much sniping on both sides. Professor Scott has long been especially anti-



Communist—and a particular target for Communist barbs on such subjects as his distrust of mass action. At the outbreak of the war the CCF, like the Communists, floundered about. At a League for Social Reconstruction conference Scott made an impassioned speech against sending Canadian boys to die on the blood-soaked fields of Europe. Then the party compromised by agreeing to back only economic support, and soon came around to full cooperation with the government. Since the end of the war, it has come closer and closer to a left-Liberal position—so close, indeed, that when Mackenzie King retired as prime minister it was reliably reported that Coldwell had been offered the job of Liberal leader. Apparently he refused because he believed he could raise his own party into the position of official opposition and in time become the government, a gamble now lost.

At present the CCF follows the British Laborites in almost every move and goes them one better in subservience to American policy. At its recent convention, it upheld Liberal policy on Korea and on practically everything else that concerns relations with other countries, in spite of shrieks from leftwingers, who still make up a good third of the party in the West and feel they are being sold out. Scott spoke of the necessity of using the profit motive for "good" ends. Lately, Angus MacInnis, long an M.P. from British Columbia, criticized his leader Coldwell for having some slight doubts on the wisdom of United States policy with regard to Formosa. Mr. Coldwell seems to have thought it ought to stay Japanese! That struck Mr. MacInnis as unfair to dear old Chiang, or maybe to MacArthur, if one may judge from his reported remarks.

The CCF government of Saskatchewan under Premier T. C. Douglas, has given this province, which suffered worst of all in the depression, the best administration any prairie province ever had. It has fostered cooperatives, treated the Indians decently, tried to bring some order and health into the fur and fishing industries, bettered education, and provided an honest civil service. But it has knuckled under to American control and exploitation of the oil fields, and has failed to make any dent on the perennial problem of what to do with the wheat farmer's surplus. This problem, of course, is quite beyond the power of any provincial government to solve.

The Communist Party, now called Labor-Progressive, was formed in 1923, from a few scattered groups. It took on its present aspect in 1929 when Tim Buck became its general secretary and leader. Its members had been the left wing of the old Canadian Labor Party; they had been active in the Winnipeg general strike of 1919 remembered as one of the bitterest labor battles on this continent, and in the Drumheller strike a few years later when miners were shot and jailed. They had been part of the One Big Union which paralleled the IWW

## MONTHLY REVIEW

in the States. In the 1929 reorganization, Tim Buck won an ideological fight with the Trotskyites of that time. His authority has been undisputed ever since. A short, stocky, English-born machinist, primly dressed in a dark suit, he looks like a retired teacher—until he starts to speak. Other leaders are Leslie Morris, who edits the *Canadian Tribune*, the only Communist newspaper since the French Canadian *Combat* was suppressed by Premier Duplessis; Stanley Ryerson, bilingual son of a French Canadian mother; J. B. Salsberg, who has made a particular study of labor-union history and tactics and who has been elected several times to the Ontario parliament; Gui Caron, French Canadian war veteran; Nigel Morgan of British Columbia.

In 1932, eight of the Communist leaders were imprisoned by the Tory government of R. B. Bennett under his famous Section 98, which was intended to wipe out Communism in Canada. This was during the worst crisis of unemployment, and at a time when Communists were actively organizing the unemployed. Canada's depression followed on the heels of the American crash; it took hold more slowly, but more harshly, and was never alleviated by any such measures as WPA or CCC. Canada's economy is tightly controlled by the chartered banks: they were not allowed to go bankrupt, and they didn't let go their hold either. People on relief came very close to starvation; a family of five on the dole in Montreal might get as little as \$37 a month. All eight prisoners were released before they served half their five-year terms, but not until Tim Buck had been shot at in his cell, after a riot in Kingston Penitentiary, by persons who were never identified or punished.

It was at this time that Fred Rose first became prominent, organizing the unemployed in Cartier. Cartier is a vast constituency in central Montreal, where are concentrated most of the garment trade workers, and some of the worst slums. Montreal slums are of a really superior vintage, because of the age of the buildings, the overloaded traffic system which forces men to live near their work, the climate which makes people huddle indoors half the year, the lack of efficient garbage disposal. There is no subsidized low-rental housing. People live in condemned tenements, in lofts, in police stations, because they have nowhere else to go. The city health department has accomplished much in the field of child care, but infant mortality is still far too high, and the tuberculosis rate in such districts is appalling. Cartier is about 40 percent Jewish and 40 percent French Canadian, with a growing population of wartime displaced persons. In the thirties it had a Jewish majority with about the same proportion of French as now. It has customarily been represented by a Jewish M.P. Rose, who is Polish by birth and speaks half a dozen languages fluently, including Canadian French, won a by-election in Cartier in 1943,

and was re-elected in the 1945 general election. Obviously many French votes were cast for him. He was the only Communist ever elected as such to the House of Commons, and he came from Catholic Quebec. He made an excellent record in the House, supporting the Liberal war effort and defending Quebec's war record. In 1946, he was arrested for transmitting secret information to Russia and is now serving a six-year term in St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary.

About a month after war broke out, the Communists came out against any aid at all to the war effort. Immediately the party was declared illegal; some leaders and union organizers were interned along with fascists at Petawawa Camp or in jail, while the top men went into hiding. The property of some foreign-language groups was confiscated. When Hitler attacked Russia overtures were made to the government—St. Laurent was then Minister of Justice—and after several months of jockeying, an agreement was reached. Tim Buck and the others surrendered to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. By October 1942 all were free. The party came into the open as the Labor Progressive Party, since the government balked at the old name. It was, however, quite willing to use the talents of Communist organizers and propagandists to mobilize the trade unions and the general public. Many young men and women from the Communist ranks, including veterans of the Mackenzie-Papineau Brigade which fought in Spain, enlisted and went overseas. One Liberal candidate in a Montreal campaign at that time remarked to the young woman volunteer who was canvassing for him: "What we need in this riding [constituency] is a good strong Communist cell." All was harmony so long as the war lasted.

Meanwhile, the Canadian version of Browderism was simmering within the party, actually a revival of the division in the twenties. It took the form of a dispute over whether Canada is a colonial nation which all classes should unite to free, ignoring internal conflicts of economic interests, or whether Canada itself is a secondary imperialist power within which the class struggle must be resolved. It was decided that the truth lay with the second position. The effect of the argument, however, was to draw many in the party, particularly French Canadians, dangerously close to the Quebec nationalists whose leaders are semi-fascist corporatists and who also want to ignore class differences in favor of including all French Canadians to liberate themselves from British imperialism. Just lately it has dawned on some of the nationalists that certain nearer neighbors are more menacing. The split in the LPP never came near the open break that Browderism caused in the States. Tim Buck never believed that cooperation with capitalists was more than a temporary expedient for the war emergency, and his leadership emerged unshaken.

## MONTHLY REVIEW

The LPP, like the CCF, reached the height of its popular vote in the 1945 election, polling more than 100,000, with its greatest strength in Ontario. It still has two members in the Ontario Parliament, some aldermen in Toronto and Winnipeg, and one in Montreal. Its 1949 vote dropped considerably, and it now has no members in the House of Commons. Party membership is estimated by outsiders to be around 15,000.

The position of the LPP in Quebec is a curious one. By the British North American Act, the constitution granted to Canada by the British Parliament in 1867, criminal law is wholly federal, Quebec thus is under Dominion criminal law, while its civil law is its own, based on the Code Napoléon. Hence so long as the LPP remains a legal party in Canada, Premier Duplessis cannot arrest its leaders for being Communists, however much he may fulminate against them. They live openly in Montreal, their names are in the phone book; they go abroad on Canadian passports; they eat and sleep, marry and die much like other men. In order to get around this legal barrier, Premier Duplessis, when he first came to power in 1936, put through his parliament the notorious Padlock Act as a means of dealing with Communism by civil law. This Act provides that any building where the police suspect that Communist propaganda is being distributed may be padlocked for a year. They don't have to prove anything; there is no direct appeal to the courts, but only to the Attorney-general, who happens also to be Duplessis. The Quebec Appeals Court has ruled the law constitutional; it has yet to be taken before the Supreme Court of Canada. During the Liberal tenure of office in Quebec, from 1939 to 1944, the law was not used, but neither was it repealed. Since 1944, Premier Duplessis has employed it several times, notably against the United Jewish People's Order last winter. The long-drawn-out trial of Madeleine Parent, textile union organizer, in the spring of 1948, was ostensibly on the charge of conspiring to intimidate the police, but most of its time was used up in efforts to prove that she was a Communist, with testimony by "experts" from Laval University.

The Bloc Populaire, clerical nationalist party which rose in Quebec during the war and died out soon after, was a manifestation of French Canadian radicalism, channelled by its Catholic leaders into opposition to the war and demands for an impossible independence for Quebec alone. It gave voice to impassioned calls for improvement of social conditions, equal wages with Ontario, better education, slum clearance—in fact to all the grievances of the ordinary French Canadian.

The Social Credit Party, which in Alberta has become merely a conventional reactionary administration, in Quebec goes raring around

as L'Union des Electeurs (disowned by its Alberta parents), with its members getting arrested for pasting up peace placards and opposing capitalist exploitation.

Personal feeling against individual Communists in Quebec has never been acrimonious as it is now in the United States, because the fellow-feeling of being French Canadian, of speaking the same language in a hostile environment, being members of an "insulted and injured" group, outweighs political differences. Liberal politicians are normally friendly to Communists if they happen to encounter them in private. Men who admit membership in the LPP still head unions in Quebec. They are working for higher wages and for peace, and Quebec wants not only higher wages but above all peace, with no part in imperialist wars. There is also a trace of tolerance for variant ideas that perhaps stems from France. The Quebec provincial police, who break picket lines and beat up strikers as part of their job, have a notably professional attitude—no hard feelings! Say "hello" to the guy next time they meet him! One of them who raided an LPP school last summer comforted an instructor whose books he was lugging off: "Our turn now, but your turn will come."

Nor does Canada as a whole present the spectacle of hysteria offered by the United States. Recent manifestations of a tendency in that direction can be attributed to American pressure, especially noticeable in American-owned companies. This does not mean that Canadian high finance is not most willing to cooperate, but it doesn't like so much noise. The Trades and Labor Congress, to which AFL unions in Canada belong, has just purged its left-wing members. A number of delegates spoke against the action; and one of them, shouting above the booing and the hammering of the gavel, said, "I charge that this convention is dominated by fear of a foreign power, whose agents are present at this meeting—the United States of America." And it is true that a labor attaché from the Embassy was seated at the press table and was busy taking notes. Yet the ousted unions still flourish. The UE has won several victories in negotiations with Canadian General Electric and others, and the AFL textile union was signing a vastly improved contract with Dominion Textile in one plant the very week that the Trades and Labor Congress kicked it out.

The famous spy trials of 1946 and '47 were damaging to the progressive cause, yet vestigial traditions of British justice were shocked by their conduct. Men were hauled from their homes at four in the morning, held incommunicado, questioned without benefit of counsel, their answers later used against them in their formal trials. *The Journal of the Canadian Bar Association* and *Saturday Night* of Toronto criticized the procedure. *Maclean's Magazine*, widely read counterpart of *Collier's*, said editorially this fall, referring to the Latti-

## MONTHLY REVIEW

more affair: "In Canada we have been relatively free of unbridled witch-hunting of this kind, but we haven't always understood that the same view a man holds because he is a Communist can be held by another in spite of the fact he is anti-Communist." There is a genuine effort to resist the witch-hunt, though not vigorous enough to stop it.

Certainly if Canada goes to war as a satellite of the United States, the LPP will be outlawed and its members jailed where they can be found. But for the moment, though their lot is difficult and growing more so, they are not yet so beset by hysteria and violence as their American fellows.

---

### "FREE ENTERPRISE" DEPARTMENT

*The extent of concentration of economic power in the motor vehicle industry in 1947, as shown in the recently published Report of the Federal Trade Commission "The Concentration of Productive Facilities."*

Rank	Company	Percent of net capital assets owned by each corporation	Cumulative percent owned
1.	General Motors _____	40.9	40.9
2.	Ford Motor Co. _____	21.9	62.8
3.	Chrysler Corp _____	5.9	68.7
4.	Budd Co., The _____	2.0	70.7
5.	Borg-Warner Corp _____	1.7	72.4
6.	Nash-Kelvinator Corp _____	1.7	74.1
7.	Kaiser-Frazer Corp _____	1.6	75.7
8.	Hudson Motor Car Co. _____	1.6	77.3

## SHAW ON SOCIALISM

George Bernard Shaw's obituaries in the press and over the radio have emphasized everything about him except what made him great—the fact that he was an ardent and active socialist. This appraisal is not ours but his own, made on the occasion of a speech on his 70th birthday on July 26, 1926. It heads the list of Shavianisms presented below. Insights and sparkling epigrams like these are, we believe, Shaw's best obituary.—THE EDITORS.

Karl Marx made a man of me. Socialism made a man of me. Otherwise I should be like so many of my literary colleagues who have just as much literary ability as I have. Socialism made a man of Mr. Wells, and he has done something. But look at the rest of the literary people and you will understand why I am inordinately proud of being a socialist. I don't care that [Mr. Shaw snapped his fingers] for my literary eminence.

*The Socialism of Shaw*, edited by James Fuchs

Do not waste your time on social questions. What is the matter with the poor is Poverty: what is the matter with the rich is Uselessness.

Preface, *Man and Superman*

Capitalism drives the employers to do their worst to the employed, and the employed to do the least for them. And it boasts all the time of the incentive it provides to both to do their best!

*The Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism and Capitalism*

A gentleman of our days is one who has enough money to do what every fool would do if he could afford it: that is, consume without producing.

A modern gentleman is necessarily the enemy of his country. Even in war he does not fight to defend it, but to prevent his power of preying on it from passing to a foreigner. Such combatants are patriots in the same sense as two dogs fighting for a bone are lovers of animals.

Preface, *Man and Superman*

There is no future for men, however brimming with crude vitality, who are neither intelligent nor politically educated enough to be socialists.

*The Socialism of Shaw*

## MONTHLY REVIEW

The old Party labels of Democrat and Republican, Labor and Nationalist, Left and Right, Whig and Tory, Liberal and Conservative, are no longer to the point: what we should ask is whether candidates are pre-Marx or post-Marx, Capitalist or Fascist or Communist. And whilst the distribution of labor and leisure remains corrupt, all governments, central or local, inevitably act as the instruments of that corruption, no matter how democratic the principles and programs of their members may be.

*Everybody's Political What's What?*

Man is the only animal which esteems itself rich in proportion to the number and variety of its parasites.

Preface, *Man and Superman*

We have had to throw freedom of contract to the winds to save the working classes from extermination as a result of "Free" contracts between penniless fathers of starving children and rich employers. Freedom of the press is hardly less illusory when the press belongs to the slaveowners of the nation; and not a single journalist is really free.

Preface to the 1908 reprint of *Fabian Essays*

The powers of life and death necessary to civilized states find their widest exercise in the institution called war, through which a whole nation, or an alliance of nations, constitutes itself an international inquisition, and, if it decides that some other nation or alliance is unfit to live, proceeds to exterminate it. Such a decision is necessarily reciprocal, as the sentenced parties can hardly be expected to agree with the verdict, and their only way to escape execution is to exterminate the exterminators. And the powers of life and death must begin at home on both sides, because, as the armies, if they had any sense, would run away to fraternize instead of slaughtering one another at appalling risks to themselves, soldiers must be shot at dawn by their own comrades if they do not fight, kill, blow-up, burn and destroy: in short, behave like homicidal madmen.

*Everybody's Political What's What?*

He who gives money he has not earned is generous with other people's labor.

Preface, *Man and Superman*

All who achieve real distinction in life begin as revolutionists. The most distinguished persons become more revolutionary as they grow older.

*The Socialism of Shaw*



## SHAW ON SOCIALISM

If there be any employer who will be "ruined" by having to reduce the hours of labor of his employees from ten, twelve, fourteen, or sixteen to eight, or to raise their wages from four, twelve, or sixteen shillings a week to twenty-four or thirty, then the sooner he is "ruined" the better for the country, which is not benefited by allowing its population to be degraded for the benefit of duffers.

*Socialism and Superior Brains*

The rich are rich because others are poor—but it is for the poor to repudiate their poverty.

*Major Barbara*

Honest education is dangerous to tyranny and privilege: and systems like the capitalist system, kept in vogue by popular ignorance, churches which depend on it for priestly authority, privileged classes which identify civilization with the maintenance of their privileges, and ambitious conquerors and dictators who have to instil royalist idolatry and romantic hero-worship, all use both ignorance and education as underpinnings for general faith in themselves as rulers. Such corruption is at present universal. Democratic education cannot be tolerated under capitalism because it inevitably leads to communism, against which capitalism has to defend itself by systematic propagation of capitalist doctrine and vilification of communist teachers.

*Everybody's Political What's What?*

Capitalism has destroyed our belief in any effective power but that of self interest backed by force.

*The Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism and Capitalism*

The taste for spending one's life in drudgery and never-ending pecuniary anxiety solely in order that certain idle and possibly vicious people may fleece you for their own amusement, is not so widespread as the papers would have us think.

*Fabian Essays*

Home is the girl's prison and the woman's workhouse.

*Preface, Man and Superman*

The secret of being miserable is to have leisure to bother about whether you are happy or not. The cure for it is occupation, because occupation means preoccupation, and the preoccupied person is neither happy nor unhappy, but simply active and alive, which is pleasanter than any happiness until you are tired of it. That is why it is necessary to happiness that one should be tired. Music after

## MONTHLY REVIEW

dinner is pleasant: music before breakfast is so unpleasant as to be clearly unnatural. To people who are not overworked holidays are a nuisance. To people who are, and who can afford them, they are a troublesome necessity. A perpetual holiday is a good working definition of hell.

Quoted by Hesketh Pearson in *G.B.S. A Full Length Portrait*

When we learn to sing that Britons never will be masters we shall make an end of slavery.

Preface, *Man and Superman*

An editor must never let the news upset him . . . To him the collapse of the British Commonwealth in the Far East must be as much in the day's work as the collapse of the Spanish Empire in South America or Gibbon's *Decline and Fall* . . . We shall not be consulted, and can only look on at the antics of Homo Insapiens, and keep up a running commentary on them . . . To the born editor news is great fun, even as the capsizing of a boat in Sydney Harbour is great fun for the sharks . . . I have advised the nations to adopt Communism, and have carefully explained how to do it without cutting one another's throats. But if they prefer to do it by cutting one another's throats, I am no less a Communist. Communism will be good even for Yahoos . . . Clifford Sharp let himself be rattled by the sinking of the *Lusitania* which did not matter a damn beyond bringing in America on our side. Hong Kong and the rest are more serious; but they are not the end of the world. So again steady, boys, steady, to fight and be conquered again and again.

Letter to Kingsley Martin, March 1942, quoted in  
*The New Statesman and Nation*, November 11, 1950

In an ugly and unhappy world the richest man can purchase nothing but ugliness and unhappiness.

Preface, *Man and Superman*

Here I am, for instance, by class a respectable man, by common sense a hater of waste and disorder, by intellectual constitution legally minded to the verge of pedantry, and by temperament apprehensive and economically disposed to the limit of old-maidishness; yet I am, and have always been, and shall always now be, a revolutionary writer, because our laws make laws impossible; our liberties destroy all freedom; our property is organized robbery; our morality is an impudent hypocrisy; our wisdom is administered by inexperienced or malexperienced dupes, our power wielded by cowards and weaklings, and our honor false in all its points. I am an enemy of the existing order for good reasons.

Preface, *Major Barbara*

## THE LEFT AND THE AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE

BY ELGIN WILLIAMS

This piece, which has unfortunately had to be held over for several months because of the Matthiessen memorial issue and a related pressure on our limited space, concludes the "Cooperation on the Left" discussion which we inaugurated in the issue of March 1950. For comment on the whole discussion see pp. 357-360.—THE EDITORS.

What the Left needs is a positive philosophy. Its aim should not merely be to establish public ownership of the means of production, abolish depression and unemployment, eliminate totalitarianism and imperialism, and so on, but literally to raise the standard of *living*. Until Left attention is focussed on this problem, its other programs will fail. Only clear delineation of something positive to fight *for*—a really creative, satisfying way of life—can call forth the "enormous stores of energy and creative ability in the American people."

For most people in the United States, life under capitalism is dull, wearying, dangerous psychologically if not also physically, above all meaningless. This is especially the case with the American way of *work*, which cannot really be called *living* in any satisfying sense at all. Yet it is precisely their work which gives meaning and satisfaction to the lives of a minority of Americans: artists, scientists, intellectuals, craftsmen. These people enjoy their work and find meaning in their lives because they determine their own conditions of work and teamwork; because there is growth and progress and differentiation in their tasks instead of lifelong repetition; because there is the sense of participation in something "larger than oneself," the carrying-forward in cumulative fashion of the knowledge and the arts which constitute civilization. The Left's task is to create the conditions which will make this kind of living and working the ordinary, accustomed, and uninterrupted possession of the entire community, *thus* ensuring (by giving people something to lose through unemployment and war) eternal suspicion of profit-seeking and conquest-minded expansionists.

Today the initiative in raising the standard of living is in the hands not of the Left but of the women's and "home and garden" magazines and the popular psychologists. Revolutionaries can ill af-

---

*Elgin Williams teaches economics at Reed College, Portland, Oregon.*

## MONTHLY REVIEW

ford to sneer at these examples of popular culture. The desire to make one's house and one's family decent and beautiful is not inferior to the desire to abolish exploitation, depression, and war. Indeed the latter program acquires meaning only as a means of achieving the former. What the Left must do is demonstrate to the masses of fundamentally decent Americans that they can't cultivate their gardens and improve their personalities—can't, as Veblen would say, grow crops and children—without nailing at the source those national and international calamities which periodically interrupt these great civilizing processes.

Today the house and family is the *only* creative outlet for most Americans, or rather for most Americans who are fortunate enough to have a house and family. Only this really engages their interest. If the "great stores of creative energy" are to be tapped, Left policy must be solidly built around the home and family. The first labor aim should be to relocate industry to reduce travel time and give men "more time with their families"—this is something the men are really interested in and, more important from the Left point of view, stabs to the heart the "managerial prerogative" of carrying on production with no reference to workers' *living*. If accompanied by work reorganization, it would also eliminate the worker so tired and hostility-ridden he can't sleep with his wife, and *therefore* eliminate the worker who is not broken-hearted to be drafted and the wife who is not inconsolable at kissing him goodbye and joining the USO.

Here, as always, *domestic* policy (note the term) leads straight to foreign policy. Leftists are puzzled that the American masses do not oppose war, do not boggle at reactionary imperialism dedicated to bolstering feudalism all over the world. What they must realize is that for most Americans, so bored day after day, even for soldiers right up to actual combat, war—so far from being hell—is reprieve. Its disadvantages, at the very least, are balanced by creative participation, adventurous teamwork, by the sense of *doing something*, so cruelly absent from the goalless competitive clockpunching of peacetime.

What is needed now is the theoretical formulation of a new American way of life, and of socialism as its "most effective defender" and extender. I think this formulation will emphasize increased mass consumption as socialists always have, but in quite a novel way. Consumption will be seen not as inert intake but as art-activity, as *living in certain ways*, and from there it will be easy to subsume production in consumption. There is no natural dividing line between home and office, since on the one hand imaginative work is relaxing and on the other good living makes good workers. The job of the Left is to spell out (what Americans now dimly see) that constructive activi-

## THE LEFT AND THE AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE

ty, "running" an economy and a civilization, is the essence of satisfaction, indeed the very meaning of life. So far Americans have been able to try out their talents at home and on their cars only; socialism is a "clean-up, fix-up, paint-up" campaign for the whole productive (art) system. It will appeal, I think, not primarily as a matter of class, but as a matter of civics. Because it replaces planlessness with planning, and unemployment and war with security and peace, socialism can truly promise to "protect the American home;" and if the Left can get around to adopting this (as it now thinks) petty bourgeois slogan it will be in.

---

*A century and a half have passed since Washington assumed the Presidency of the United States. In that period, the most important change that has occurred in men's minds is their transfer of emphasis from form to substance. Their passions, from political, have become social. They see no more validity in the present distribution of welfare than their ancestors saw in seventeenth-century England or in eighteenth-century France in schemes they believed they had the power and the right to transcend. They are no more willing to accept our social diseases as inevitable than their ancestors were prepared to accept the ancien régime as a final form of government.*

*A revolution has already shaped itself in men's minds which makes them judge the states under whose authority they live by their power to offer the masses economic security upon the basis of expanding welfare. That, in our time, has become the meaning of freedom to the masses all over the world. It is held in India and in China, as well as in Britain and in the United States. In its name, an upheaval at least as profound as that of 1789 in France has changed the whole way of life of the Russian people and has set new currents stirring in every quarter of the globe.*

—Harold J. Laski, *Reflections on the Revolution of Our Time*

## **FREEDOM UNDER SOCIALISM: A COMMENT**

BY THE EDITORS

With much that Mr. Kaminsky says about "Freedom under Socialism"\* we are in full agreement. It is clear that a collectivist society makes severe demands on the individual in the interests of the proper functioning and healthy development of the social organism as a whole. These demands are not contrary to the true interests of the individual; in fact, the person who recognizes that the individual can develop and blossom only as a part of a vigorous and harmonious society will gladly accept the obligations and duties of collectivism and will find freedom in the increasing fulfillment of the human desires and aspirations of himself and those around him.

This attitude, however, could hardly be expected to prevail in the early phases of the transition from capitalism to socialism. The majority, brought up under the moral code of capitalism which stresses the rights of the individual and ignores the rights of society, is likely to find the demands of a collectivist society the negation of the kind of "Freedom" which they previously enjoyed.

The transition period between capitalism and socialism, which is to be measured in generations and not merely in years or even in decades, could be described in terms of a struggle to wean people away from their allegiance to capitalist "Freedom," with all that it implies in the way of social disorder, economic depression, and human destruction, and to win them to an acceptance of the more complex conception of socialist freedom, with all that it implies in the way of social harmony, economic health, and human progress. The struggle is not an easy one, and it necessarily takes a thousand forms and goes through numerous phases. It centers around a vast process of education and persuasion, in which precept and practice mutually and cumulatively reinforce one another; but it also involves the use of moral pressure and even physical coercion to keep the recalcitrant from throwing monkey wrenches into the machinery of social change.

This, we take it, is a fair summary of Mr. Kaminsky's main thesis. We accept it. We also go along with Mr. Kaminsky in his implied contention that it is precisely this struggle to win people to an acceptance of socialist freedom which today dominates the social evolu-

---

\* *MR*, November 1950, pp. 345-353.

tion of that part of the world which has decisively broken with capitalism and is in the process of building socialism.

But when all this has been said, we do not think that the subject of "Freedom under Socialism" has been by any means exhausted. Two socialists can say "amen" to everything up to this point and still find themselves in sharp disagreement about many aspects of the problem under discussion. Granting that coercion of individuals against their will is sometimes necessary, we still have the questions: How much coercion? What kinds of coercion? We also have the question: How much of the coercion that is actually observable in the socialist world today is related to the building of socialism and how much can be explained by other factors?

Obviously these are very large questions, and it would be impossible even to attempt to answer them in a brief note. In order to illustrate the problems they raise, let us take just one point. Socialist society must enforce compliance with certain norms of conduct. To what extent can it do this by methods which we in the West have come to associate with the term "due process of law"? How far can the necessary rules be laid down in advance and their meaning be made stable and predictable? How far can the authorities be held to these rules by such devices as *habeas corpus*? In other words, how far can socialism adapt to its requirements the legal forms and principles which many socialists—and we believe it could be shown that Marx and Engels were among them—believe to be among the great achievements of bourgeois civilization? Are these forms and principles irrevocably tied to the content of bourgeois "Freedom" or are they equally compatible with the content of socialist freedom? For our part, we do not see any inescapable reason why socialism should not be able to enforce its necessary discipline by "due process of law."

But this is not to argue that we cannot see plenty of reason why Soviet Russia and the other countries in the socialist world actually do use methods which often flagrantly violate the western idea of due process. Their historical background, the bitter social struggles of the last three decades, the obvious hostility and bellicosity of the surrounding capitalist world: all these factors and many others have to be taken into account if we are to understand how these countries have developed and the methods their regimes use to reach socialist goals.

It is essential to a proper understanding of the socialist world to take these things into account; but it is not essential, in fact it is wrong, to assume that the transition to socialism will be exactly the same in all countries undergoing the transition from capitalism to socialism. Communists, to be sure, tend to make precisely this assumption; they take the position that whatever happens in the USSR

and the other socialist countries is both necessary and good. As Mr. Kaminsky says, they reject or suppress all criticism without in any way coming to terms with such criticism, and he calls this practice "as simple as it is stupid." And yet one may ask whether Mr. Kaminsky has really come to terms with the kind of criticism of the USSR which emanates from unquestionably sincere socialist sources. Must we really accept Mr. Kaminsky's verdict that:

No matter what sort of socialism we want, this [that is, the Soviet type] is the socialism we shall get once we manage to abolish, in America, the exploitation of man by man. And it follows that, no matter what kind of freedom we might like, the type of freedom we are all working for as socialists can only be that type of freedom actually existing or being created in the socialist world today. (p. 346.)

This, it seems to us, is far too dogmatic a view. History is not so neat and logical. Do the background and traditions of a country play no role in the quality of the freedom it will achieve under socialism? Why can't we accept the great accomplishments of the Soviet Union, frankly admit that it has blazed the trail to socialism under historical conditions which have been extremely difficult, and yet work for a form of socialism here in America which both preserves as much as possible of what we love in our own past and comes closer to meeting our ideal of the good society?

Mr. Kaminsky might argue that this question betrays a utopian attitude. Perhaps. But so far at any rate he has not convinced us. We agree that there is a very great difference between bourgeois "Freedom" and socialist freedom. We believe that the allegiance of the overwhelming majority of mankind must and will shift from the former to the latter. We concede that the process of transition is bound to be long and difficult. But we are not persuaded that all or even the larger part of the suppression and coercion which characterize the socialist world today is explained by this process of transition, still less that it is an essential accompaniment for all times and all countries.

---

*Freedom which has genuine meaning is more than a timeless abstraction, more than an absence of restraints. It is something shaped freshly in each generation wrestling with the conditions which in that particular time limit and extend freedom.*

—Helen M. Lynd, *The Nature of Freedom In Liberal Education*



## THE POVERTY OF STATESMANSHIP

The following editorial appeared in the *Wall Street Journal* of October 31, 1950. We do not, of course, agree with everything it says; but we publish it as evidence that there are responsible voices in the ruling class speaking out against the present footless and essentially stupid drift to disaster. This is a vitally important fact in the present American scene. To overlook it, as the Left is all too inclined to do, is to distort one's estimate of the forces which are working against a third World War.—THE EDITORS.

In this issue Mr. Crowley reports the latest cold-war strategy devised by the policy-makers in Washington.

We do not quarrel with the policy-makers for seeking ways to resolve the East-West conflict; it is the most important thing with which they could be concerned. Nor do we underestimate the difficulties of that search. Our quarrel is with the singular aridity of their approach.

The basis of the policy-makers' latest plan is an arms race—surely the least imaginative and historically the least rewarding application of diplomacy. We are to spend perhaps a quarter of a trillion dollars arming ourselves and the rest of the non-Soviet world.

To be sure, the policy-makers set a kind of limit to the arms race they envision. After five or six years we would supposedly be strong enough to enter into fruitful negotiations with the Soviets. This is, indeed, what is new in the plan: the already-inaugurated arms race is to lead to a point at which we can negotiate through strength on such "outstanding issues" as Austria, Germany, Japan, and disarmament.

But this assumes a great deal. It assumes, for one thing, that Soviet rearmament will proceed no further than it has. There is little doubt the western world can in the long run outproduce the Soviet, but it can hardly be certain that the Soviet has now reached its peak in arms production. If the Soviet exerts every effort to keep ahead of the West—as it is bound to do under the impetus of an arms race—the West will not have matched the Soviet in five years or with the expenditure of even a fantastic quarter of a trillion dollars. That is one of the troubles with arms races; by their very nature they constantly gain momentum until something explodes.

The revised cold-war strategy also assumes a Soviet halt on the diplomatic front. If we are to wait until we are as strong as Russia

before we negotiate, it can be inquired what the Soviet is going to be doing about the outstanding issues in the meantime. Five years is a long time—how long can be gauged by the fact that the last five has witnessed a complete reversal of American policy toward Russia. The Soviet is already proposing a peace treaty with Germany, it appears willing to discuss the possibility of a peace treaty with Japan, and it has made at least the semblance of concession in its attitude toward disarmament.

If we refuse to negotiate in earnest on these issues for five years, who is going to appear in the position of obstructing settlements—the Soviet Union or the United States?

There other things about the plan that disturb us. One is the idea of building up certain countries—West Germany or Korea, for example—as showplaces of democracy. The theory is that people in neighboring Communist countries would see how prosperous democracies get and be encouraged to revolt against their masters.

To accomplish this, of course, millions or billions would have to be poured into the showplaces. This strikes us as phony economics and dubious morality. Indeed, it is just about as phony as a well-known Russian trick—Potemkin's construction of model villages to impress Catherine the Great.

Then there is the question of what happens to the American economy as a result of the expenditure of a quarter of a trillion dollars. The Soviets, who count on the collapse of the American economy, can be expected to welcome this aspect of the plan with particular warmth.

But basically our criticism of this latest policy is that it is not a policy at all. It is an excuse for the lack of policy. To determine on an arms race and withhold from negotiations is merely to reveal how impoverished one's statesmanship is.

---

*I rejoice at every effort men make to organize; I do not care on what basis they do it. Men sometimes say to me, "Are you an Internationalist?" I say, "I do not know what an Internationalist is"; but they tell me it is a system by which the working men from London to Gibraltar, from Moscow to Paris, can clasp hands. Then I say God speed, God speed, to that or any similar movement.*

Wendell Phillips

(continued from inside front cover)

that the discontinuation of MR would be a terrible loss—especially at this point. We hope that the enclosed \$40 will be of some help; as well, we will try to get additional subscriptions."

We are very grateful, of course, to those of you who have sent in substantial sums. But we were specially moved by two letters, one from Chicago and one from Nebraska. The first said: "I haven't earned a buck in seven years, thanks to polio. But if MR suspended publication I would miss more than the enclosed two bucks. I would miss a little magazine with a big voice. The Matthiessen issue was superb."

And the second: "I am down and all but out financially, at present trying to exist on a social security stipend of \$31 per month; but I had rather starve a day than see MR blink out, so I am enclosing \$1 and shall try my damndest to do as much each month through the coming year so long as my stipend continues. Surely, a lot of your subscribers are able to do a lot better than this." Many of them no doubt can do more, but none could do better.

In our appeal, we urged those who cannot afford to contribute money to concentrate on getting new subscribers. Among the responses to this suggestion, we liked this one best: "Enclosed money for two subs to MR. Promise to get you 23 additional subs by end of November."

That's the spirit which is responsible for the fact that new subs are coming in at a faster rate this month than at any time since MR started publication. If it would spread to *all* of our readers, we could easily triple our circulation and become self-supporting within a year. But the sad truth is that *most* of our readers are apathetic. They neither contribute money nor bring in new subscribers. What to do about them is a difficult question. They seem never to be moved by anything short of catastrophe. They are probably like those readers of *In Fact* who paid no attention to George Seldes' appeals for help—until it folded. Only then, *after* it had ceased publication, did they wake up and send in hundreds of letters enclosing checks and pleading with Seldes to start up again. But by that time it was too late.

MR is definitely over the crisis. We can continue publication—but not much more. We still don't have the money to devote to the kind of promotion and advertising which would enable us to expand our circulation and become self-supporting. Will those from whom we have not yet heard please take note?

The Xmas gift blanks are enclosed again this month. They make it easy for you to help. Won't you fill out yours today?

We have been asked by Kingsley Martin, editor of that excellent British socialist publication *The New Statesman and Nation*, to print the following note: "I am collecting material for a biographical memoir of Professor Harold J. Laski, and am anxious to see letters and material which throw light on his life and opinions. He was a prolific letter-writer and had many friends in the United States. I should be most grateful if any one who has preserved his letters, or other material concerning him, would lend it to me. All letters and manuscripts will be copied and carefully returned at once." The address is: Kingsley Martin, c/o *The New Statesman and Nation*, 10 Great Turnstile, London W.C.1, England.

# Give Your Friends for Xmas The Truth About Socialism

By LEO HUBERMAN

Lear Publishers

Price: \$3.00

*Both scholarly and simply written so that many—there ought to be millions—who want to know what this subject, which is dividing the whole civilized world, is all about, can find the answer in plain good English.*

—IN FACT

*A book on socialism that is different from those hitherto published. . . . Discusses in language so plain and easy to read as to be entertaining, the principles of socialist economy and the manner and method by which those principles can be practically applied.*—GEORGE H. SHOAF

*Readable, informative and lively. Huberman's case against Capitalism is powerful and convincing. His case for democratic Socialism is sound and logical. This book is especially useful at this time. It should be read by a large audience of Americans, for they, above all others, are in need of this volume's enlightenment.*—E. HALDEMAN-JULIUS

## SPECIAL COMBINATION OFFER!

	Regular Price
One-year subscription to MR .....	\$3.00
THE TRUTH ABOUT SOCIALISM .....	3.00

**BOTH FOR \$4.00**

**You Save \$2.00**

This offer applies to both renewals and new subs.  
Or send \$3.00 and we will mail the book postpaid.

